FAX NO.

P. 11

Customer No.: 31561 Application No.: 10/709,849 Docket NO.: 12920-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-18 remain pending in the present application. This pending Office Action rejected Claims 1-8 and 10-17 for failing to meet the non-obviousness requirements set forth in 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant respectfully traverses and argues against the rejections in the following.

The Office Action also objected to Claims 1 and 10 for the informalities therein.

In response thereto, Applicant has duly rectifies the informalities as instructed and the objections are believed to be thus rendered moot.

Applicant greatly appreciates the indication from the Examiner of Claims 9 and 18 as containing allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. After careful consideration, Applicant incorporates a response specifically thereto in the discussion of claim rejections of Claims 1 and 10 upon which Claims 9 and 18 depend.

Reconsideration of the pending claims and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under U.S.C. §103(a)

P. 12

AUG-16-2007 THU 09:39

007 THU 09:39

Customer No.: 31561

Application No.: 10/709,849 Docket NO.: 12920-US-PA

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo

(US 2004/0227895, hereinafter referred to as "Yoo") in view of Lee (US

2004/0085371, hereinafter referred to as "Lee").

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yoo and Lee applied to Claims 1-8 above, and further in view of Kim (US

2004/0113881, hereinafter referred to as "Kim").

As regards Claim 1, the Office Action held that the source drivers of the present

application can be obtained from Yoo by "a combination of data drivers and an

external circuit providing common voltages to a "common voltage applying member".

The Office Action also asserted that the adjustable common voltage generating circuit

comprised in each of the source drivers of the instant case is the external circuit

providing a common voltage to the common voltage applying member. Hence, if

the common voltage regulating circuit of a liquid crystal display (LCD) as taught by

Lee is combined with Yoo, i.e., Yoo as modifiled by Lee, the Office Action held, can

achieve the desired technical effect Claim 1 of the instant case.

Applicant respectfully traverses the allegations and hereby sets forth the reasons

of the traversal as follows.

Yoo does not disclose or even teach at all that the external circuit providing

common voltages to the common voltage applying member can be incorporated to the

10

PAGE 12/15 * RCVD AT 8/15/2007 9:36:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/5 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12

AUG-16-2007 THU 09:40 FAX NO. P. 13

Customer No.: 31561 Application No.: 10/709,849

Docket NO.: 12920-US-PA

data drivers or the scan drivers.

Each of the adjustable common voltage generating circuits in Claim 1 of the

present application compensates its outputted common voltage according to the

common voltage adjustable data provided by the timing sequence controller so as to

make each common voltage outputted by each adjustable common voltage

generating circuit the same, even the common voltages outputted to the ITO layer of

the panel of the LCD the same as well. Nevertheless, the common voltage

regulating circuit as taught by Lee does not regulate the common voltage supplied to

the ITO layer of the panel according to the common voltage adjustable data from

the timing sequence controller (the SDA as alleged by the Examiner). More

specifically, SDA and SCL can either be generated by the data generating section

itself, or provided externally by an external member. Lee does not specify SDA and

SCL are provided by the timing sequence controller.

In view of the above-mentioned, Applicant respectfully submits that Yoo and Lee

do not disclose, teach or suggest the all the limitations and technical features disclosed

in Claim 1, whether alone or in combination, and that people of ordinary skill in the

art do not have clear and sufficient motivation to combine the teachings from the Yoo

and Lee references, and further, the combined teachings of Yoo and Lee do not and

cannot achieve the technical features desired to be arrived at in Claim 1.

11

PAGE 13/15 * RCVD AT 8/15/2007 9:36:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/5 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12

AUG-16-2007 THU 09:40 FAX NO.

P. 14

Customer No.: 31561

Application No.: 10/709,849

Docket NO.: 12920-US-PA

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections made by the

Examiner in the Office Action do not stand to reason and Claim 1 is distinctly and

sufficiently patentable over prior art of record and thus should be allowed.

As regards Claim 10, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 10

at least for grounds as stated in the above discussion and asserts that Claim 10 should

be allowed as well. If Claims 1 and 10 are allowable, Claims 2-8 and 11-17 are also

allowable as a matter of law.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9 and 18 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter but are

objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims.

In response thereto, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 10, on which claims 9

and 18 depend respectively are discussed above as allowable. Therefore, claims 9

and 18 are submitted to be novel and unobvious over the cited prior art references,

and thus should also be allowed.

12

PAGE 14/15 * RCVD AT 8/15/2007 9:36:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/5 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12

Customer No.: 31561

Application No.: 10/709,849 Docket NO.: 12920-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending Claims 1-18 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application and withdrawal of the current rejections and objections is courteously requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

B

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office 7th Floor-1, No. 100 Roosevelt Road, Section 2

Taipei, 100

Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800 Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Email: <u>belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw</u>
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw